

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/741,521	VEGLIANTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac N Hamilton	3724	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Isaac N Hamilton. (3)_____.
- (2) Ms. Diane Dunn McKay. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 January 2003 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: N/A .

Identification of prior art discussed: Fish and Art of IDS filed 3-16-2001, especially Keene et al .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Although Fish and Keene et al were used in the final rejection mailed on 01-01-2003, the references were not cited in the form 892 in the last Office action, Paper No. 12. Paper No. 03 had all of the references crossed-out in the IDS and applicant's representative wanted to know if the art in the IDS was considered. The Examiner crossed-out all the references in IDS of Paper No. 03 because the references were not provided as required by 37 CFR 1.98. The Examiner has considered the art in the IDS Paper No. 03, which includes Keene et al, and has made it part of the record by signing the IDS Paper No. 03.